

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAIME LOPEZ PAEZ,

No. C07-05240 MJJ

Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
ADMISSION OF ATTORNEY *PRO HAC*
VICE FOR JEFFREY GRIFFITHS**

v.

MICHAEL CHERTOFF,

Defendant.

Before the Court is an application for attorney admission *pro hac vice* by Jeffrey Griffiths, who represents that he is an active member in good standing with the bar of the Indiana Supreme Court. (Docket No. 3.) Defendants oppose the application.

On November 5, 2007, the Court ordered Mr. Griffiths to submit a declaration stating facts that would demonstrate why he is qualified for admission *pro hac vice* under the requirements of Civil Local Rule 11-3(b). The Court has reviewed Mr. Griffiths' sworn declaration. (Docket No. 6.) In it, Mr. Griffiths states that he resides within the state of California (¶ 3), and also that he has applied for *pro hac vice* admission in approximately ten different cases before the Northern District of California in the past year (¶ 10). Mr. Griffiths did not disclose either of these salient facts in his original application.


The Court finds that Mr. Griffiths does not satisfy the requirements of Civil Local Rule 11-3(b) for *pro hac vice* admission. Civil Local Rule 11-3(b) expressly states that Mr. Griffiths is not eligible for permission to practice *pro hac vice* if he resides in the state of California. Civil Local Rule 11-3(b)

1 also states that Mr. Griffiths is not eligible for permission to practice *pro hac vice* if he is “regularly
2 engaged in the practice of law in the State of California.” Mr. Griffith’s numerous applications for *pro*
3 *hac vice* admission over the past year raise a concern that he is engaging in the regular practice of law
4 in California. Mr. Griffiths’ declaration does not set forth any facts that would allow him to fall within
5 the exceptions recognized by Civil Local Rule 11-3(b).

6 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 11-3(b), the Court **DENIES** Mr. Griffiths’ application for *pro hac*
7 *vice* admission. Moreover, in the interests of ensuring that the Judges of this Court are able to consider
8 future *pro hac vice* applications from Mr. Griffiths based on a full record, Mr. Griffiths is further
9 **ORDERED** to file a copy of this Order together with any *pro hac vice* applications that he submits,
10 from this date forward, in any matter before the United States District Court for the Northern District
11 of California.

12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13
14
15 Dated: December 12, 2007



MARTIN J. JENKINS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE